

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 28, 29, 31-48, and 51-69 are presently active in this case.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 28, 29, 35, 42-54, 57-65, 67, and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hazelton et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,234). Claims 31-34, 36-41, 55, 56, 66, and 69 were objected to for being dependent from a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Firstly, Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 31-34, 36-41, 55, 56, 66, and 69 and the courtesy of Examiner Kim to interview this case on March 16, 2005, the substance of which is substantially summarized herebelow.

During the interview, Applicant's representative, discussed the reaction forces generated in Hazelton et al from the movement of the wafer stage 56, the transference of vibrations from the reaction forces through the stands 62 into the ground, and the use of damping means 60 in Hazelton et al to prevent transference of the ground vibrations into the optical components. Hazelton et al in Figure 3 show the use of planar journal bearings 64 to isolate the vibrations from ground (i.e., to permit motion of the stands 62 on the planar journal bearings 64 due to the reaction force without transference of the


reaction forces to ground). Nonetheless, Hazelton et al in Figure 3 show the continued use of damping means 60 even when the planar journal bearings 64 are used. As such, the planar journal bearings 64 in Hazelton et al are not damping members. Indeed, the planar journal bearings 64 in Hazelton et al are not disclosed as damping members, whereas explicit damping means 60 are disclosed in Hazelton et al.

Given the understanding and agreement reached during the interview with regard to the planar journal bearings 64 in Hazelton et al not being a damping member, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 28, 46, 58, 64, and 67 and the claims dependent therefrom patentably define over Hazelton et al.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Masayasu Mori

Registration No. 47,301

Attorney of Record

Ronald A. Rudder

Registration No. 45,618

## CUSTOMER NUMBER

22850

Tel.: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413-2220

MM/RAR/clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\206379US\RFR.DOC